

REPORT ON INFORMATION COLLECTED CONCERNING APPLICANT

Under section 60835 of title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, the Bureau of State Audits is responsible for collecting information concerning applicants for the Citizens Redistricting Commission that is needed by the Applicant Review Panel to perform its responsibilities. This is a report by Bureau staff in compliance with that responsibility.

Name of Applicant: Paul L. McKaskle.

Information: Bureau staff researched Applicant's prior redistricting experience. Staff discovered that Applicant twice served as counsel to special masters appointed by the California Supreme Court to perform redistricting – in 1973 and 1991. Regarding the 1973 effort, Governor Reagan vetoed the Legislature's redistricting bills, so redistricting was left to the Supreme Court. Applicant was retained as counsel for the special masters appointed by the Supreme Court to perform the task. The special masters were directed to comply with various standards and criteria, including the applicable provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the provisions of article XXI, section 1 of the state Constitution. According to the decision of the Supreme Court adopting the redistricting plan proposed by the special masters, *Legislature v. Reinecke* (1973) 10 Cal.3d 396, "Paul L. McKaskle, a law professor at the University of San Francisco and an experienced attorney, was retained as counsel and staff supervisor; Gordon E. Baker, a professor of political science, and Perry L. Stauffer, a management consultant with computer data processing experience, were retained as consultants, and three research clerks and two secretaries were also employed." Regarding the 1991 effort, Governor Wilson vetoed the Legislature's redistricting bills, and immediately petitioned the Supreme Court to intervene. The Court appointed three retired appellate judges as special masters to develop redistricting plans. These special masters retained Applicant to play the same role he played during the 1973 redistricting effort.

In the "Family Information" section of his supplemental application, Applicant disclosed having a son but did not state whether he had a bona fide relationship with him. Staff asked Applicant about his relationship with his son, and Applicant responded that his son has been on his own for over 15 years and he does not have a bona fide relationship with him.

Staff contacted John Coons, the author of one of Applicant's letters of recommendation, to confirm the information provided in the letter and receive any additional information that may be relevant. Mr. Coons confirmed the information in the letter. Mr. Coons also stated that the redistricting discussions he has had with Applicant were not on structures of committees or details of the work but on the "substance and forms" of redistricting. He also stated that Applicant has a "strong reputation with those who know and care about this process." Mr. Coons further stated that Applicant is a "generous person" who can correct people without "calling them a damned fool," and that he admires Applicant for his "political balance."

Recommendation: None.

Name and title of person submitting response: Steven Benito Russo, Chief of Investigations.

Report Date: September 13, 2010.